

U. S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION DATED 04/07/06

TO: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attn: Anita M. King, Examiner Art Unit: 3632

RE: Application/Control Number 10/654,408

Filed: 9/3/2003

Applicant: Leonard A. Duffy and Robert B. Duffy pro se

Title: FOLDING CANTILEVER SUPPORT AND METHOD

This response includes:

- I. REQUEST FOR CONTINUING EXAMINATION form PTO/SB/30
and fee \$395 Separate Document
- II. SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW 05/10/2006
- III. PROPOSED CLAIM AMENDMENTS
- IV. REMARKS and RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION OF 04/07/2006.

**EXHIBIT A. COPY OF DRAFT AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED FOR
INTERVIEW**

(which Examiner agreed reads over prior art)

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard A. Duffy

and

Robert B. Duffy pro se, applicants

This communication includes a total of 17 pages, plus PTO/SB/21 Transmittal,
PTO/SB/30 RCE form, and 4 page attached copy of applicants faxed correspondence for
interview.

II. APPLICANTS SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW 05/10/2006

RE: Telephone Interview 05/10/06 with Anita M. King, Examiner 10 –10:15 am
Based on Draft Amended Claims 1,2,3,12,13,16,and 17 dated 05/04/2006 previously sent via fax

1. When asked about procedural course after Final rejection, examiner replied that applicants must apply for a RCE: Request for Continuing Examination.
2. Examiner stated that the draft amendments forwarded by fax on 05/04/06 read over the prior art of record. However, the examiner will need to do a further search after submission of an RCE . But, the claims as per the proposed amendments overcome the prior art presently in the record.
3. When asked "Does there appear to be patentable matter in application?", examiner stated "Based on the search so far, it is possible".
4. On the question of when to amend presently withdrawn claims, examiner stated that they can be amended at any time but will not be considered until a generic claim is allowed.
5. On the issue of combination vs. subcombination as per the OA of 4/07/06, examiner said the subcombination of device only as in the proposed draft can be claimed in an independent claim, and that the device in combination with the structure could also be claimed as a dependent or independent claim.
6. If, at the appropriate time, minor changes are needed regarding dependent claims in final stages, examiner suggested that she could call with suggestions.

A copy of the proposed amendments submitted for the interview are attached. It should be noted that the presently proposed Amendments submitted immediately below include minor changes from the interview draft and that amendments additional claims are also included. The changes are explained below under remarks.

Applicants have since received Examiners Interview Summary dated 5/11/2006.

III. AMENDED CLAIMS

In response to the office action dated 04/07/2006, please amend the claims of the present application as follows: